

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action mailed March 20, 2008, claims 1 – 4 and 7 – 10 were rejected. In response, Applicant proposes amending claims 1 and 3. Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks.

Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art and in view of Rao et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,770,886, hereinafter Rao). Additionally, claims 7 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao and further in view of Saitoh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,570,490, hereinafter Saitoh). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao and Saitoh the reasons provided below.

Claim 1

Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to particularly point out that the Schottky diode is a “pure” Schottky diode. Support for this amendment is found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, paragraphs [0026] and [0027] (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0231863 A1).

Applicant asserts that the acknowledged prior art in view of Rao does not teach a rectifier circuit that takes the form of “a pure Schottky diode with a parasitic p/n junction” as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, while Rao may teach using a Schottky diode for ESD protection, neither the acknowledged prior art nor Rao teach or suggest using “a pure Schottky diode with a parasitic p/n junction” as recited in amended claim 1.

In support of the rejection, the Final Office action states that “it is inherent that the Schottky diode consists of pure Schottky diode and a parasitic pn junction.” (Final

Office action, page 3) However, Applicant asserts that a Schottky diode does not inherently consist of a pure Schottky diode and a parasitic p/n junction as alleged in the Final Office action. Firstly, the Final Office action does not provide any factual support for the statement that “it is inherent that the Schottky diode consists of pure Schottky diode and a parasitic pn junction.” Applicant respectfully requests that this statement be factually supported. Secondly, Applicant respectfully points out that a Schottky diode is known in the field to consist of a single junction between a semiconductor layer and a metal coating, see for example, the definition of a “Schottky barrier diode” in McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, Sixth Edition. Applicant has not found a definition of a Schottky diode in which the Schottky diode inherently consists of a pure Schottky diode and a parasitic p/n junction.

Because Rao does not teach “a pure Schottky diode with a parasitic p/n junction” as recited in amended claim 1, Applicant asserts that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Independent Claim 3

Independent claim 3 has been amended to include a similar limitation to claim 1. In view of the similarities between claim 3 and claim 1, Applicant asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claim 3. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 3 is not rendered obvious from the prior art references.

Dependent Claims 2, 4, and 7 – 10

Claims 2, 7, and 8 are dependent on claim 1 and claims 4, 9, and 10 are dependent on claim 3. Applicant respectfully asserts that these claims are allowable at least based on allowable base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Date: May 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111